would not find the claims indefinite. Evidence of the art acquired understanding is in the very publication relied upon by the Examiner as being relevant with respect to the claimed invention. Suga et al. (EP 0 683 180 A2) ("Suga") uses the term "metallocene-type" throughout the publication. There are other patents filed prior to Applicants' filing date that also use the term in question. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully asked.

Claims 1, 4, 8-10, 13-17, 19, 20, 23-28, 30 and 33-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suga. It is the Examiner's position that Suga discloses a bulky metallocene compound and a carboxylate metal salt that is supported on an inorganic oxide. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere within the four corners of Suga is there any disclosure of a carboxylate metal salt that is supported on an inorganic oxide. The Examiner states "Suga et al. fail to disclose an actual example where the metal salt is a metal carboxylate salt." Even if there were such a disclosure in Suga, it would not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention. According to Suga, the metal salt is employed as an ion exchange material that is used with an ion-exchanging layered compound (page 7, line 3 of Suga). The layered material is a clay that contains anions, such as hydroxy groups, pending from the layers. When the ion exchanging material penetrates between the clay layers, an exchange occurs amongst the anions between the clay layers and the anion of the ion-exchange material. Such chemistry is completely different from Applicants claimed invention. The carboxylate metal salts used in the invention, not even exemplified in Suga, are not employed as an ion exchange material for a support material such as a clay.

Applicants' invention, among others, is to provide an olefin polymerization catalyst that allows for the polymerization of olefin(s) with essentially no fouling during the polymerization process. Suga desires to improve polymerization activity and the molding properties of the obtained resin. Applicants treat a catalyst with a carboxylate metal salt, not a clay. Where a supported catalyst is employed, the support is first contacted with the catalyst, and thereafter, the supported catalyst is treated with a carboxylate metal salt. There is no exchange chemistry taking place as in Suga. A review of all the examples in Suga reveals that the clay is first treated chemically, then heat-dehydrated, and thereafter, contacted with the catalyst. There is simply no ion exchange occurring in accordance with Applicants' claimed invention. The purposes of the ion exchange material of Suga and Applicants' metal carboxylates are completely unrelated, the results of the two inventions are unrelated and the chemistry of catalyst preparation is completely different. In view of these remarks it is respectfully submitted that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 18, 29, 32 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suga in view of Hara et al. (EP 0 376 145) ("Hara"). The Examiner relies on Suga for reasons recited in paragraph 4 of the Office action. The Examiner relies on Hara for disclosing metal carboxylates where the alkyl group has more than 2 carbon atoms. It is respectfully submitted that Hara do not satisfy the deficiencies in Suga. Even if one were to employ the metal carboxylates of Hara in Suga